

MAGYARORSZÁG ÉS A RÓMAI SZENTSZÉK II.

Vatikáni magyar kutatások a 21. században

Szerkesztette

TUSOR PÉTER, SZOVÁK KORNÉL
FEDELES TAMÁS



BUDAPEST ♦ RÓMA

2017

*Bibliotheca Historiae Ecclesiasticae Universitatis Catholicae de Petro Pázmány nuncupatae
Series I, sub Alto Patrocinio Em.mi ac Rev.mi*

P. Card. ERDŐ

A Szerkesztőbizottság elnöke - President of the Editorial Committee

Mons. J. TÖRÖK

Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae

Sorozatszerkesztő - Moderator

P. TUSOR

Kiadja az MTA-PPKE Fraknói Vilmos Római Történeti Kutatócsoport

Published by the MTA-PPKE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group

*A kutatásokat, a kötet elkészítését és megjelentetését az MTA TKI, a PPKE (KAP 16-71042-1.1 KP)
és a Nemzetközi Magyarstudományi Társaság támogatta*

*The researches and the edition were sponsored by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Péter Pázmány Catholic
University and the International Association for Hungarian Studies*



<http://institutumfraknoi.hu>

© *The authors and the editors, 2017*

ISSN 1786-2116

ISBN 978 963 508 850 8

ISBN ebook 978 963 508 855 3

Felelős kiadó

Publisher responsible

a Gondolat Kiadó igazgatója

the Director of "Gondolat" Publishing House

Szerkesztette, szedte és tördelte - Typography

a Typographia Pannonica

Olvasószerkesztő - Corrector: V. Kanász

Borítóillusztráció - Coverillustration: G. Xantus

Kiadásra előkészítette - Prepared for publication

a GONDOLAT Kiadó - the Publishing House "Gondolat"

A „RAKACA-AFFÉR”
Adalék az Apostoli Szék és a magyar görögkatolikusok
kapcsolataihoz a két világháború között
(Forrásközlés)¹

A kora újkori egyházi unióktól kezdve a Rómával egyesült bizánci szertartású (görögkatolikus) egyházak sorsának alakulása a magyar egyháztörténet sajátos színfoltját jelenti. Míg az első 100–150 évben a magyarországi görögkatolikus egyházak egyértelműen a nemzetiségek (ruszin és román) világához kötődtek és így az érdeklődés homlokterétől is távol álltak, a 18. század végétől egyre markánsabban megjelenő magyar nyelvű görögkatolicizmus képviselői a 19. század késői hatvanas éveitől kezdve sikeresen irányították magukra a közvélemény figyelmét. A magyar nyelv liturgikus használatáért és egy önálló magyar görögkatolikus egyházmegye felállításáért folytatott több évtizedes küzdelmük, melyet a magyar közvélemény nagy érdeklődéssel és többnyire szimpátiával kísért, számos fájó kudarc után részsikerhez vezetett.² 1912-ben az Apostoli Szék beleegyezett a Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye megalapításába, ugyanakkor a magyar nyelv liturgikus használatának kérdésében továbbra is elutasító álláspontot képviselt.³

Bár az újonnan felállított – s a nyelvhasználati tiltás ellenére mindenki által „magyar görögkatolikusnak” nevezett – Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye ekkor csupán egyike volt a Magyar Királyság nyolc bizánci szertartású katolikus egyházkormányzati egységének, az első világháború katasztrofális kimenetelének köszönhetően 1920-ban Nyíregyháza, Miklósy István hajdúdorogi főpásztor székvárosa, az ország egyetlen görögkatolikus püspöki székhelye lett. A Csehszlovákiához került Munkácsi, valamint az Eperjesi Egyházmegye Magyarországon maradt parókiáit az Apostoli Szék 1924-ben kormányzóságba szervezte, s Papp Antal érsekre, az

¹ A Vatikáni Titkos Levéltárban végzett kutatásaimat az OTKA K 108 780. sz. kutatási pályázata támogatta.

² Források és bevezető tanulmány az 1778–1905 közötti időszakhoz: VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS–KATKÓ MÁRTON ÁRON, *Források a magyar görögkatolikusok történetéhez. I: 1778–1905* (Collectanea Athanasiana II/4/1), Nyíregyháza 2014.

³ VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS *A Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye megalapításának közvetlen előzményei*, Athanasiana 35 (2013) 109–121.

egykori munkácsi püspökre bízta, aki Miskolcon megtelepedve irányította a kezdetben mindössze 21 egyházközségből álló adminisztratúrát.⁴

A kevesebb mint száz parókiát számláló és rendkívül szerény anyagi alapokkal rendelkező két egyházkormányzati egység paradox módon mégis ekkor indult el azon a rögsz úton, melynek végállomásán 2015-ben a magyar görögkatolikusok számára az Apostoli Szék sajátjogú és metropolitai rangú egyházat alapított.⁵ A magyar görögkatolikus közösségeket az új államhatárok fizikailag is leválasztották az anyaegyházmegyéktől és az önálló fejlődés pályájára kényszerítették. Kétségtelen, hogy az alig néhány éves egyházszervezettel rendelkező görögkatolikusok erre semmiképpen se voltak felkészülve. Ennek és a rendkívül kedvezőtlen külső és belső viszonyok eredményeként a magyar görögkatolikusok élete a két világháború között⁶ és kommunizmus évtizedeinek jelentős részében a túlélésről és a megmaradásról szólt. Ezen nem csekély feladat sikeres abszolválása teremtette meg az alapokat ahhoz, hogy az 1989/90-es politikai rendszerváltoztatásnak köszönhető kedvező légkörben a görögkatolikus egyház mintegy negyedszázad alatt rendkívül jelentős fejlődésen ment keresztül,⁷ amit a sajátjogú metropolitai egyháziság megszerzése koronázott meg.

* * *

Jelen forrásközléssel a két világháború közötti évtizedek görögkatolikus szempontból jellemző problémáihoz szeretnék adalékokkal szolgálni. A budapesti nunciatúra gazdag iratanyagából⁸ egy olyan ügy dokumentumait választottam ki, mely az első olvasás után a kutatónak két szempontból is meglepetést tartogat. Az

⁴ A Miskolci Apostoli Exarchátus rövid története: SZÁNTAY-SZÉMÁN ISTVÁN, *A Miskolci Apostoli Kormányzóság első tizenöt éve (1925–1940)*, A Miskolci Görög Szertartású Katolikus Apostoli Kormányzóság története, területi és személyi adatai fennállásának 15. éves évfordulóján, Miskolc 1940, 3–21; Uő, *Tizenöt éves a Miskolci Görögkatolikus Apostoli Kormányzóság*, Keleti Egyház 1940/11. sz., 235–238.

⁵ Ferenc pápa 2015. március 19-ei döntése öt apostoli konstitúcióban, illetve bullában nyert konkrét jogi formát. **1.** Az *In hac suprema* kezdetű apostoli konstitúcióval a Szentszék új egyházi kereteket hozott létre a Magyarországi Görögkatolikus Sajátjogú Metropolitai Egyház megalapításával. **2.** A *De spirituali itinere* kezdetű apostoli konstitúcióval az 1912-ben alapított Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye főegyházmegyei rangra emelkedett. **3.** A *Qui successimus* apostoli konstitúció az 1924-ben létrehozott Miskolci Apostoli Exarchátust egyházmegyei rangra emelte. **4.** Az *Ad aptius consulendum* apostoli konstitúció megalapította a Nyíregyházi Egyházmegyét. **5.** Ugyanezen a napon Ferenc pápa Kocsis Fülöp hajdúdorogi püspököt érsek-metropolitává nevezte ki.

⁶ A két világháború közötti időszakhoz: VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS, *Az Apostoli Szék és a magyar görögkatolikusok kapcsolata a két világháború között*, Magyarország és a Szentszék diplomáciai kapcsolatai 1920–2015 (szerk. Fejérdy András), Budapest 2015, 147–172.

⁷ A kommunizmus évtizedeihez és az 1990 utáni időszakhoz: VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS–TERDIK SZILVESZTER, „...minden utamat már előre láttad”. *Görögkatolikusok Magyarországon*, Strasbourg 2012, 68–109.

⁸ A nunciatúra archívumához újabban: TÓTH KRISZTINA–TUSOR PÉTER, *Inventarium Vaticanum I, A Budapesti Apostoli Nunciatúra levéltára (1920–1939)* (CVH I/14) Budapest–Róma 2016.

első meglepetést mindenképpen az okozza, hogy miként is kerülhetett egyáltalán egy ilyen jelentéktelennek tűnő ügy a Keleti Kongregáció elé? A második meglepetést az ügy kivizsgálása során használt módszer okozza.

Miről is van szó? A források tanúsága szerint 1938. június 25-én a Keleti Kongregáció megbízta Angelo Rotta budapesti nunciust, hogy vizsgáljon ki egy ügyet.⁹ Meg nem nevezett személyek arról tájékoztatták a dikasztériumot, hogy Papp Antal érsek, a Miskolci Apostoli Kormányzóság adminisztrátora utasította a rakacai parókust, hogy a Szent Liturgiát ne ószláv, hanem magyar nyelven végezze. A nuncius június 30-án megkezdte a kivizsgálást, de nem az érintett főpásztort vagy a rakacai parókust szólította meg, hanem Subik Károly egri kanonokot, érseki irodaigazgatót.¹⁰ Ez utóbbi szintén nem az érintettekhez fordult, hanem megbízta Füstös Pál apátot, diósgyőri plébánost, akit „a legügyesebb papunk” jelzővel mutatott be a nunciushoz, hogy járjon utána az ügynek. Füstös apát valóban cselesen oldotta meg a feladatát: néhány egri papnövendéket maga mellé vett és színlelt kirándulás keretében ellátogatott Rakacára. Ott a mit sem sejtő jámbor parókustól begyűjtötte a szükséges információt, mely szerint a hír részben igaz: valóban érkezett egy rendelet Papp Antal kormányzótól, melynek értelmében a Szent Liturgia csendes részeit ószlávul, a hangos szövegeit pedig magyarul kell végeznie.¹¹ Erről Subik kanonok tájékoztatta a nunciátúrát,¹² néhány szempontot is megemlítve, melyekre lentebb bővebben visszatérünk. A nuncius július 14-én továbbította az információt a Keleti Kongregációnak¹³ azzal a felvetéssel, hogy talán érdemes lenne megkérdezni Papp Antal érseket is...

Július 19-én a Keleti Kongregációban megszületett a döntés: a nuncius kérdezze meg az érseket,¹⁴ s július 23-án – vagyis csaknem egy hónappal a vizsgálat megkezdése után – Rotta nuncius tájékoztatást kért Papp Antal kormányzótól.¹⁵ A részletes válasz augusztus 8-án meg is született,¹⁶ s augusztus 13-án a nunciátúráról elindult Rómába.¹⁷

Papp Antal érsek levelében kifejtette, hogy a megfogalmazott váddal ellentétben ő éppen a Miskolci Apostoli Kormányzóság hivatalos liturgikus nyelve, az ószláv védelme érdekében hozott intézkedést. Ugyanis mind a rakacai hívek, mind pedig más parókiák hívei még a világi hatóságoknál is (Horthy Miklós kormányzót is megkeresve!) azt szorgalmazták, hogy a szomszédos Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegyében elterjedt gyakorlatot átvéve ők is teljesen magyarul végezhesék a Szent

⁹ *Függelék*, 1. sz. irat.

¹⁰ *Függelék*, 2. sz. irat.

¹¹ *Függelék*, 3. sz. irat.

¹² *Függelék*, 4–5. sz. irat.

¹³ *Függelék*, 6. sz. irat.

¹⁴ *Függelék*, 7. sz. irat.

¹⁵ *Függelék*, 8. sz. irat.

¹⁶ *Függelék*, 9. sz. irat.

¹⁷ *Függelék*, 10. sz. irat.

Liturgiát. Az érsek-kormányzó hiába próbálta megértetni a hívekkel és a hatóságokkal, hogy a liturgikus nyelv megváltoztatása nem lehetséges, s a hajdúdorogi gyakorlat – amit a kormányzóság nem egy papja már 1925-ben, az érsek hivatalba lépésekor, átvett – kánonellenes. Látva törekvései eredménytelenségét, próbálta menteni a menthetőt és elrendelte a rakacai parókusnak, hogy a Liturgia nem „lényegi” részeit végezze magyarul, míg a „lényeginek” tekintett eucharisztikus kánonot kizárólag ószlávul imádkozhatja. Ez a gyakorlat más parókiákon már korábban kialakult, s erről az érsek egyébként az 1935-ben Rómába küldött *ad limina* jeletésében a Szentszéket is értesítette. Valószínűleg ez az utalás is hozzájárult ahhoz, hogy az ügy itt le is zárult.

* * *

Az eset rövid összefoglalása után néhány szempontot érdemes közelebbről megvizsgálni.

Némi meglepetést kelt, hogy a szentszéki dikasztérium érdeklődését egyáltalán fel lehetett kelteni egy olyan információval, mely Magyarország legkisebb egyházi közigazgatási egységének egyik jelentősnek semmiképpen se mondható, mindössze néhány száz hívőt számláló parókiájára vonatkozott. Feltételezhető, hogy az információ olyan személytől érkezett, akinek a jelzését a kongregáció nem hagyhatta figyelmen kívül. Az is lehetséges, hogy a feljelentés nem is Magyarországról származott. A dokumentumokból kiderül, hogy ezekben az években Bobák János¹⁸ rakacai parókus két fia¹⁹ is Rómában tanult. Talán ők újságolták el társaiknak és/vagy előjáróiknak az otthonról érkező hírt, mely aztán elferdítve eljutott a dikasztériumba.

Az információ forrásától függetlenül fontos kérdés az, hogy miért számított a liturgiában használatos nyelv ennyire kényes, nagy érdeklődést keltő problémának? A magyar görögkatolikusok történelmi útja a magyar nyelv liturgikus hasz-

¹⁸ Petkócson (Zemplén vm., ma Petkovce, Szlovákia) született 1879. január 20-án. Teológiai tanulmányait Eperjesen végezte. Vályi János megyéspüspök 1902. szeptember 14-én szentelte az Eperjesi Egyházmegye papjává. 1924-ben került a Miskolci Apostoli Exarchátus kötelékébe. Ájfaluscán (1902–1904) és Viszlón (1904–1920) h. lelkész, majd Rakacán parókus (1920–1965). Szentszéki tanácsos (1926), tb. kanonok (1940). 1965. július 4-én hunyt el. Felesége: Chanáth Teodóra, gyermeik: Miklós (1904), Miklós (1906), György (1908), Tivadar (1910), Metód (1912), János Irén (1914), Elek (1915), Sándor Cirill (1916), Pál (1918), Mária (1919). VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS, *Görögkatolikus papok történeti névtára. I: A Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye és a Miskolci Apostoli Exarchátus 1850 és 1950 között szentelt papjai* (Collectanea Athanasiana V/1), Nyíregyháza 2015, 74.

¹⁹ Az 1914-ben született János és az 1916-ben született Sándor. A paróchusnak további három fia, Miklós (szül. 1906), György (szül. 1908) és Tivadar (szül. 1910) is pap lett. Ők hárman az Eperjesi Egyházmegyében szolgáltak, míg a két legfiatalabb a háború után az Egyesült Államokba költözött és ottani közösségekben szolgált. VÉGHSEŐ, *Görögkatolikus papok történeti névtára*, 173.

nálatának igényével kezdődik.²⁰ Az ószláv és a román liturgikus nyelv felváltása, illetve a liturgikus szöveg magyar fordítása a 18. század második felétől a magyar identitású görögkatolikusok legfőbb törekvése, melyet a Szentszék – egyetértésben a magyarországi latin szertartású katolikus püspökök testületével – mindvégig elutasított. A 19. század végén szigorú szentszéki tiltások születtek, melyek néhány évvel később – a kialakult nyelvhasználati gyakorlat megszüntetésének kivitelezhetetlenségét belátva – hallgatólagos tűréssé szelődtek.²¹

Ez azonban az elvi tiltást 1912-ben, a kifejezetten a magyar görögkatolikusok számára létesített Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye alapításakor sem módosította. A *Christi-fideles Graeci* kezdetű alapító bulla az új egyházmegye liturgikus nyelvét az ógörögöt tette, melynek elsajátítására a Szentszék a papságnak három évet adott. A magyar nyelvet csak olyan mértékben engedélyezte használni, amilyen mértékben az a latin szertartásban is használatos. A *Propaganda Fide*, majd az abból 1917-ben önállósult Keleti Kongregáció vezetői – akik 1911–1912-ben határozottan ellenezték a Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye felállítását – élénk figyelemmel kísérték a magyar görögkatolikusok liturgikus nyelvhasználatát, s valahányszor a hajdúdorogi püspök a hároméves türelmi időszak újabb és újabb meghosszabbítását kérte, diadalittasan rámutattak korábbi aggályaik megalapozottságára.²²

Míg a Szentszék az 1912-es alapítást követő években még komoly reményeket fűzött a görög nyelv tényleges bevezetéséhez, 1920 után fokozatosan ismét a hallgatólagos tűrés álláspontjára helyezkedett. A Keleti Kongregáció 1922-ben még tett ugyan egy kezdeményezést arra, hogy a Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegye liturgikus nyelveként – látva a görög bevezetésének lehetetlenségét – az ószlávot tegye kötelezővé, de ennek kudarcá²³ után egészen a II. Vatikáni Zsinaton bemutatott magyar nyelvű liturgiáig (1965) a kérdés nem került ismét napirendre. A Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegyében többnyire az a gyakorlat terjedt el, hogy a Szent Liturgiát magyarul végezték, csupán az eucharisztikus kánonban (anafóra) az alapítás szavai hangzottak el görögül.

Az egyházmegye első, 1920-ban megjelent saját liturgikonja²⁴ az eucharisztikus kánon²⁵ görög és magyar nyelven tartalmazza, de a gyakorlat az volt, hogy a papok csak az alapítás szavait énekelték görögül. Egyesek ettől is eltértek, s mindent magyarul végeztek. A „vegyes” megoldás abból az elgondolásból született, mely különbséget tesz

²⁰ Az első liturgiafordításokhoz: NYÍRÁN JÁNOS, *Az első magyar nyelvű liturgiafordítás Lupess István 1814-es kéziratában*, Nyíregyháza 2011; IVANCSÓ ISTVÁN, *Liturgia. Krucsay Mihály munkács megyei kanonok 1793-ban készült munkája*, Nyíregyháza 2003.

²¹ A sajátos „*tolerari potest*” álláspont elfogadtatásáért sokat tett a tudós jezsuita, Nikolaus Nilles. VÖ. VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS, *Nikolaus Nilles és a magyar görög katolikus liturgia ügye*, Symbolae. A görög katolikus örökségkutatás útjai. A Nikolaus Nilles SJ halálának 100. évfordulóján rendezett konferencia tanulmányai (Collectanea Athanasiana I/3; szerk. Véghseő Tamás), Nyíregyháza 2010, 91–98.

²² VÉGHSEŐ, *Az Apostoli Szék és a magyar görögkatolikusok*, 152.

²³ Az ügy iratai: ASV Archivio della Nunziatura in Ungheria, busta 5, fasc. 7/9, fol. 615–648.

²⁴ Miskönyv.

a Szent Liturgia „lényegi” és „nem lényegi” részei között. Bármennyire is vitatható ez a különbségtétel, tény, hogy ezt a Szentszék is elfogadta, s a szigorú tiltások, majd pedig a „*tolerari potest*” korában is a dokumentumokban alkalmazta. A „lényegi” részek az eucharisztikus kánont tekintették, míg az összes többi – többnyire könyörgések (ekténiák), a pap és a hívek közötti párbeszédek, az énekek és az olvasmányok – a „nem lényegi” kategóriába kerültek. A szigorú tiltás ez utóbbiakra is vonatkozott, míg a tolerancia idején a különbségtételt a Szentszék elfogadta.

A liturgikus nyelv kérdésében sajátos fordulatot jelentett a Miskolci Apostoli Kormányzóság megalapítása 1924-ben. Mivel ez az egyházkormányzati egység az ósláv liturgikus nyelvű Eperjesi és Munkácsi Egyházmegyéek Magyarországon maradt parókiáiból állt össze, hivatalos liturgikus nyelve természetesen az ósláv lett. Amint az Papp Antal érsek leveléből kitűnik, maga az érsek-kormányzó is az ósláv liturgikus nyelv híve volt, s ellenezte a Hajdúdorogi Egyházmegyében kialakult gyakorlatot. Sőt, levele végén azt is megjegyzi, hogy a közbeszédben (például az ekkor induló rádióközvetítésekben) már elterjedt a „magyar rítus” elnevezés is a görögkatolikusok vonatkozásában.²⁵ Az érsek azonban bármennyire is szerette volna az ósláv nyelvet megőrizni a liturgiában, a görögkatolikus hívek körében mindig is jelenlévő, s a trianoni Magyarországon felerősödő asszimilációs igényekkel szemben tehetetlen volt.

A magyar nyelv liturgikus használata iránti igény ugyanis nemcsak abból fakadt, hogy a hívek szerették volna érteni is a szertartásokban elmondott és énekelt imádságokat. Legalább ugyanakkora jelentősége volt annak az igénynek is, hogy az ósláv és a román nyelvtől való megszabadulással egyszersmind az életüket megkecsesítő társadalmi stigmáktól is megszabaduljanak. A közgondolkodás hosszú időn át – gyakorlatilag a 20. század közepéig – a bizánci szertartást a magyarországi nemzetiségek, a szlávok és a románok világához kötötte, s azt a magyar identitással összeegyeztethetetlennek tartotta. Konfliktusok idején ez a fajta tartózkodás gyanakvássá fajult és a magyar görögkatolikusokat a megbízhatatlanság stigmájával sújta. Subik Károly kanonok a beszámolójában egy nagyon jellemző esetet idéz fel a saját életéből, amikor az első világháború idején tévedésből görögkatolikus papnak nézték, s ezért hátrányos megkülönböztetés érte.²⁶

A trianoni sokk hatása alatt álló magyar társadalomban felerősödött a görögkatolikusokkal szembeni gyanakvás és az a gondolkodás, mely szerint „megbízható” magyar nem lehet bizánci szertartású.²⁷ Mivel ennek a hétköznapi életben

²⁵ Papp Antal érsek és Miklósy István hajdúdorogi püspök kapcsolatát komoly ellentétek terheltek meg. Ezeknek csupán egyike volt a liturgikus nyelv kérdése.

²⁶ *Függelék*, 4. sz. irat.

²⁷ Egy jellemző példa: 1937-ben Matolcsy Mátyás kispárti képviselő parlamenti felszólalásában nehezményezte, hogy a szatmári Károlyi-birtokok betelepítése során görögkatolikus vallású családok is földhöz jutottak. Véleménye szerint kívánatos lenne, ha a román határ közelében csak „tiszt magyar fajú, egészen biztos, rendíthetetlen magyar fajiságú emberek jussanak magyar földhöz”. Idézi: PIRIGYI ISTVÁN, *A magyarországi görögkatolikusok története II*, Nyíregyháza 1991, 129.

is komoly megnyilvánulásai voltak (az államigazgatásban például az alkalmazás, vagy a munkahelyi előmenetel is függött tőle), az egyéni életstratégiák kialakítása során nagyon sok görögkatolikus jutott arra a döntésre, hogy elhagyja rítusát. A rítusváltást megkönnyítette az, hogy 1929-től kezdődően a Keleti Kongregáció a nunciusok jogkörébe utalta az ügyet, ami jelentős változás volt a korábbi gyakorlathoz képest.²⁸ A budapesti nunciatúra iratai között az 1930-as évekből vaskos dossziékat találunk rítusváltoztatási kérelmekkel, melyek jelentős része házasságkötéshez fűződik.²⁹ Ezekben az esetekben a görögkatolikus fél jellemzően azzal indokolja rítusváltoztatási kérelmét, hogy anélkül jövődöbelijének családja egészen egyszerűen nem fogadja be. A rítusváltoztatások megtizedelték a görögkatolikus értelmiséget, hiszen jellemzően a városi környezetben élők jutottak erre a döntésre.

A hívek körében tehát erős motivációk mozgatták a magyar nyelv minél szélesebb alkalmazását, amivel szemben Papp Antal érsek se tudott hatékonyan fellépni. Míg az 1920-as években a Miskolci Apostoli Kormányzóságban még az ósláv nyelvű görögkatolicizmus térségbeli egyetlen reményét látta, az 1930-as években vezető papjai már az élen jártak a magyar nyelvű fordítások elkészítésében.³⁰

* * *

A görögkatolikusokkal szembeni előítéletesség, mely a társadalmi kapcsolatokat jellemezte, a katolikus egyházon belül is élt. Erre jó példa éppen a rakacai ügy kivizsgálásának módja. Bár a józan ész szabályai azt sugallnák, hogy egy ilyen kérdésben elsőként a leginkább érintett személyek, nevezetesen Papp Antal érsek és Bobák János parókus kapjanak lehetőséget a tisztázásra, a nuncius rutinszerűen a területileg illetékes latin szertartású egyházmegyét kéri meg az információszerzésre. Maga az információszerzés módja – a kirándulás fedőtörténete – is mély bizalmatlanságra utal, mivel azt valószínűsíti, hogy a nunciatúra és megbízottjai szerint a közvetlen tájékoztatás-kérés nem vezetett volna a kívánt eredményre, az igazság kiderítésére. Mindez azt bizonyítja, hogy mintegy 300 évvel az egyházi unió után és az asszimiláció hosszú és alapvetően eredményes évtizedeit követően a magyar görögkatolikusok előtt még mindig hosszú út állt a teljes és maradéktalan társadalmi és egyházi integrációig.

²⁸ Addig Rómába kellett felterjeszteni a kérelmeket. A rendelkezést 1940-ben vonták vissza. SZLÁVIK ANTAL, *Sajátjogi egyháztagság. Normafejlődés és aktuális kérdések*, Budapest 2006, 171–172.

²⁹ Például ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 54 (1937), fasc. 2/1–5, fol. 235–533.

³⁰ Ilyen például az 1934-ben kiadott és ma is használatos zsolozsmáskönyv.

FÜGGELÉK

I.

Róma, 1938. június 25.

A Keleti Egyház Kongregációja Angelo Rotta budapesti nunciushoz
(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 46r – orig.)

SACRA CONGREGATIONE
„PRO ECCLESIA ORIENTALI”

Città del Vaticano, 25 Giugno 1938.

1407-1455/II. Prot. N. 358/38.

Mentionem facias, quaeso, huius numeri in tua responsione

Si prega di citare questo numero nella risposta

Eccellenza Reverendissima,

Essendo pervenuta notizia, a questo S. Dicastero, che l'Ecc.mo Mgr. Papp avrebbe di recente ordinato al parroco di Rakaca di celebrare la S. Liturgia non più in paleoslavo ma in lingua ungherese, prego l'Eccellenza Vostra Reverendissima di volere indagare in merito e riferirne alla S. Congregazione, indicando come stiano realmente le cose.

In attesa, con sensi di distinto ossequio ho il piacere di confermarvi
di Vostra Eccellenza Reverendissima

G. Cesarini arcivescovo

A Sua Eccellenza Reverendissima

Mgr. ANGELO ROTTA

Nunzio Apostolico in Ungheria

BUDAPEST

2.

Budapest, 1938. június 30.

Angelo Rotta nuncius Subik Károly kanonokhoz
(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 47r – concept.)

1408/38./II.

Personalis. die 30 Junii 1938.

Illustrissime ac Reverendissime Domine,

A Sacra Congregatione pro Ecclesia Orientali interrogatus sum, respondeat
necne veritati Excellentissimum ac Reverendissimum Dominum ANTONIUM

PAPP, Archiepiscopum graeci ritus, Miskolcini sedem habentem, nuper praecepisse Parocho vici RAKACA, in Comitatu Borsodiensi, ut deinceps SACRAM LITURGIAM non amplius in lingua paleoslavica sed in lingua hungarica celebret.

Pro certo habeo Dominationi Tuae Illustrissimae ac Reverendissimae haud deesse media, quibus certas informationes sibi procurare potest eosque mecum benigne communicare dignabitur, quid in hac re veritati respondeat.

Pro benigno favore jam in antecessum gratias quam maximas referens, profundi obsequii mei sensa depromens permaneo

Dominationi Tuae Illustrissimae ac Reverendissimae
in Christo addictissimus

Archiepiscopus Thebar.,
Nuntius Apostolicus

Illustrissimo ac Reverendissimo
CAROLO SUBIK
Praelato Dom. S. S., Canonico E. C.
Cancellario Archiepiscopali
AGRIAE

3.

Diósgyőr, 1938. július 8.

Füstös Pál diósgyőri plébános Subik Károly kanonokhoz

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 48r-49r – orig.)

ad numerum 1449/28 II

†

Kedves Károlykám!

Folyó hó 4.-én kelt szives soraidat 6.-n kaptam kézhez és 7.-én, tegnap, autóra szedtem fel a plebániám területén időző 3 theologus kispapot azzal, hogy esperesi körutat végzek és megmutatok nekik egy kiválóan szép gör.kath. templomot, ahol megismerhetik esetleg a felsőborsodi görög katolikusok templomát és szertartásait, kiszállottam Boldvaszilas felé Tornászentjakabra, majd onnan ebéd után a Rakaca völgyén le Rakacára. Szerencse kísért, mert ft. Bobák János gk.lelkész ur épen fent volt a templomban, s mikor megkértem, hogy a kispapjaimnak mondja el a klasszikus gk.templom építésének történetét, a templom helyének történelmi jellegét, a templomi freskók és ikonosztáz szimbolikus jelentőségeit, hogy kispapjaimnak helyes ismeretök legyen a gk.templom és szerelvényeinek mibenlétéről. A kedves házigazda mit sem sejtve, szívesen magyarázgatott, majd megmutogatta a különféle ruhákat, könyveket stb. s ennek keretében a feltett kérdéseidre a következőket tudtam meg: Rakaca gk.lelkészség az eperjesi gk.egyházmegeye elszakított

részéhez tartozik s ez idő szerint Papp Antal c. érsek, miskolci ap. kormányzó ur őexcellenciája joghatósága alá tartozik. Bobák János gk.lelkész ur immár 30 éve működik ott. Mikor odakerült, ó-szláv nyelven kellett végeznie a sz.misé. A temetési szertartást magyarul végezték. E rendhez ragaszkodott az egyházi hagyomány és jogszokás tiszteletében. Több szó esett előtte, hogy az ó-szláv misézés helyett magyar nyelven végezhetné a sz.misé, de e gondolatnak mindig ellenállt, annál is inkább, mert két fia Rómában theologus (egyik diaconus, a másik subdiaconus) s gyakrabban [fol. 48v] lejárt Rómába fiai látogatására s egyik alkalommal a római sz.Péter-templomban magyar nyelvű gk. misekönyvet kért, mire azt a feleletet kapta ott, hogy olyan nincs, ellenben ó-szlávot kapott és úgy misézett. Ez is egyik érve volt az ellen, hogy magyarnyelvű liturgiát vezessen be plebániájára. Nézete szerint sokkal jobb lett volna, ha annak idején az ó-szláv nyelvet sem engedték volna meg, hanem amint a nyugati kereszténység egységes liturgikus nyelve a latin, úgy a keletieknél lett volna a görög, de ha már az ó-szlávot tették annak idején kötelezővé, ahhoz ragaszkodott. Most már majdnem egy esztendeje kapott a felsőbb egyházi hatóságtól egy írásbeli rendeletet, melynek értelmében ezentul a sz.mise csendes részeit végezheti ó-szláv nyelven, de a hangos részeket magyarul kell végeznie.

Közbevetett érdeklődésre kijelentette: „Igen, Papp Antal érsek ur rendelte el így.” Majd beszélgetésünk során megtudtam még, hogy a hivek közül főleg az idősebbeknek ez az ujtás nem igen tetszett és nehezen tudtak beleilleszkedni, neki pedig igen furcsa, mert a megszokott misekönyve ó-szláv, magyar szövegű misekönyvük nincs, a magyar szövegbetétek gyarlók s kellemetlen sz.mise alatt hol az egyik könyvből, hol a másik kis füzetből felváltva végeznie a végzendőket. Azonban az engedelmeséget gyakorolnunk kell, s a felsőbb hatóságnak engedelmeskedve végzi így teendőit. – Elbeszélgettünk még sok egyébről, hiszen a templom, annak építése – mely az ő műve volt –, annak fekvése és tájéka, a rakacai hegyekből kikerült igazán szép szürkemárványkereszt és szenteltvíztartók stb. bőven adtak társalgási témát. Majd rövid időre megtiszteltük kedves papi otthonában, hol az ifju levitáknak örömmel mutatta meg falusi papi otthonának egyik örömét, az épen [fol. 49r] előző napon pergetett elég nagy mennyiségű mézet, buzdítva őket arra, hogy a falusi pap, ha mellékfoglalkozásként méhészettel foglalkozik, idejét hasznosíthatja és a jóságos apró méhek nagyon hálásak azok iránt, akik velük szeretettel foglalkoznak, majd ha falura kerülnek, barátkozzanak meg a méhessel.

Kiszállásom célhoz vezetett, a kért dolgokat feltűnés nélkül megtudtam, az ifjú leviták pedig egy kellemes és hasznos kiránduláson vettek részt anélkül, hogy tudták volna azt, hogy mily praktikus volt statisztálásuk.

Diósgyőr, 1938. július 8.-án

Őszinte szeretettel ölel a legmélyebb tisztelettel

hűséges hived s barátod
Füstös Pál

4.

*Eger, 1938. július 9.**Subik Károly Szemerecsányi Lajos egri érsekhez*

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 50v– orig.)

ad Numerum 1449/38 II

VITÉZ SUBIK KÁROLY

†

Kedves Jó Főatyám!

A nuncius ur ŐExcellenciája kegyes volt engem felhívni, hogy a rakaczai görög szertartású istentiszteletek jelenlegi nyelvéről tájékoztassam. A helyszínére egyik legügyesebb papunkat, Füstös Pál apát, esperes, diósgyőri plébánost küldöttem ki, aki megbízatásának kellő óvatossággal tett eleget. Természetesen Füstös apáttal nem közöltem, hogy miért érdekel engem ez a kérdés.

Jelentésemben részletekre nem terjeszkedtem ki. Ha ŐExcellenciáját érdekli, kegyeskedjék Füstösnek idezárt levelét Neki lefordítani, hogy teljesen tisztán láthassa a helyzetet.

Ez az istentiszteleti nyelvi kérdés, megvallom, nem könnyű. A görög katolikusokat nálunk általában oroszoknak nevezik tulajdonképpen azért, mert régebben mindenütt, ma pedig csak egyes helyeken ó-szláv az istentiszteleti nyelvük. Ezért sok támadás éri őket és nemzeti szempontból sok gyanúsítás. A mozgósításkor 1914.-ben magam is furcsán jártam. Kassára vonultam be és szállásom a mostani [fol. 50v] honvédelmi miniszter ur, Rátz Jenő gyalogsági tábornok, akkor még fiatal kapitány anyósának a házában jelöltetett ki. És amikor ennél a derék és buzgó katolikus asszonynál jelentkeztem, hogy bemutatkozzam, a lehető legridegebben fogadott és még csak le sem ültetett. Két hét múltán, mielőtt a harctérre kimentünk volna, bucsu látogatást tettem házi-asszonyomnál és akkor sült ki, hogy engem valami félreértés folytán görög katolikus papnak nézett s következőskép árulónak tartott, amit nagy bocsánatkérések között hozott tudomásomra.

Ezt a kis epizódot csak azért hoztam fel, hogy méltóztassék látni, hogy még a buzgó és hitéletet élő latin szertartású katolikusok is nemzeti szempontból hogy vélekednek a görög szertartású testvéreinkről, aminek egyik oka szertartásuknak szláv nyelve. Bizony igaza van a Füstös apát levelében említett Bobák János rakaczai görög katolikus papnak; amikor azt mondja, hogy áldásosabb volna, ha nem az ó-szláv, hanem a görög nyelv volna a keletiek liturgikus nyelve.

Eger, 1938. július 9.

Imáiba ajánlottan, őszinte tisztelettel vagyok

vitéz Subik Károly

5.

*Dátum nélkül**Subik Károly kanonok levele Angelo Rotta nunciushoz*

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 51r– cop.)

(Copia) N.1449/38 II
vitez Subik Károly

Excellentissime ac Reverendissime Domine
Archiepiscopo et Nuntie Apostolice!

Aestimatisimis Excellentiae Tuae litteris de die 30, m. elapsi sub n. 1408/38. ad me datis benigne provocatus, ut causam usus linguae quoad Sacram Liturgiam in pago Rakaca investigarem, honori mihi duco Excellentiam Tuam Reverendissimam certiozem facere me interventu cuiusdam vicarii foranei in regione ista dexteritate praeclaris et omni exceptione maioris secreto et absque ulla ostentatione, quae infra sequuntur, comperisse.

Parochiam graeci ritus Rakaca, quae olim ad Dioecesim graeci ritus Eperjensem pertinebat, hodie vero ad Administraturam Apostolicam Miskolcensem pertinet, iam 30 fere annis, qua parochus Joannes Bobak administrat, qui est sacerdos spiritus vere ecclesiastici et cuius duo filii Romae studiis theologicis operam navant. Sacerdos iste Missae sacrificium praescriptis ecclesiasticis conformiter in Rakaca semper in lingua paleoslavica celebrabat, dum anno elapso Ordinarius proprius, Excellentissimus ac Reverendissimus Dominus Antonius Papp Archiepiscopus et Administrator Apostolicus Miskolcensis eidem praecepit, ut deinceps partes in Sacrificio Missae submissa voce peragendas possit quidem in lingua paleoslavica recitare, partes autem alta voce peragendas in lingua hungarica celebret.

Mandato huic praefatus parochus satisfecit.

Felicem me profiteor Excellentiae Tuae obsequium praestare potuisse, imacum reverentia deosculans manus sacras maneo

Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimar
in Christo filius humillimus

vitéz Carolus Subik
Praelatus Dom. S.S., Abbas,
Canonicus a Latere,
Cancellarius Aeppalis.

6.

*Budapest, 1938. július 14.**Angelo Rotta nuncius levele a Keleti Kongregációhoz*(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 52^{rv}– concept.)

1407-1455/1938. II

(con allegato) 14 luglio 1938.

Eccellenza Reverendissima,

Ricevuto il pregiato Foglio dell'Eccellenza Vostra Reverendissima in data 25 giugno 1938, Nr. 358/38, mi sono interessato per avere notizie circa la proibizione che sarebbe stata fatta da Sua Eccellenza Mons. Papp dell'uso della lingua paleoslava nella parrocchia di Rakaca.

Mi sono rivolto, in via confidenziale, a Mons. Subik, che é Cancelliere nella Curia Arcivescovile di Eger. Acchiudo qui la risposta avuta, di cui ho fatto copia per questo Archivio.

Il fatto, come risulta, é vero, ma nella lettera di Mons. Subik non si dá alcuna spiegazione sulle ragioni di tal modo di procedere da parte di Mons. Papp. Per sapere quali siano i motivi di un tale provvedimento preso da Mons Papp, l'unico mezzo, che io conosca, sarebbe di domandarglielo direttamente. Se codesta S. Congregazione lo crede utile e conveniente, io non avrei alcuna difficoltà ad interpellarlo direttamente: non l'ho fatto, per il timore, senza la previa intesa con codesta S. Congregazione, di un passo falso. Forse non è da escludersi che Mons. Papp sia stato indotto a tale provvedimento sia dall'esempio della Diocesi di Hajdudorog, sia anche forse dal desiderio di far così cosa grata [fol. 52^v] soprattutto a quei fedeli. Osservo qui che in genere fedeli di rito orientale, soprattutto quelli che vivono ai confini dell'Ungheria, a causa anche della lingua che usano nella loro liturgia, vengono considerati quasi come non ungheresi: il che non fa a loro piacere.

SalutandoLa cordialmente godo raffermarmi
dell'Eccellenza Vostra Reverendissima

Sua Eccellenza Reverendissima
Monsignore GIUSEPPE CESARINI
Assessore della S. Congregazione
per la Chiesa Orientale.
CITTÀ del VATICANO

7.

Róma, 1938. július 19.

A Keleti Kongregáció Angelo Rotta nunciushoz

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 53r– orig.)

SACRA CONGREGATIONE
„PRO ECCLESIA ORIENTALI”

Città del Vaticano, 19 Luglio 1938.

1479/38-1546 II. Prot. N. 358/38.

Mentionem facias, quaeso, huius numeri in tua responsione

Si prega di citare questo nella risposta

Eccellenza Reverendissima,

Prego Vostra Eccellenza Reverendissima di volere interrogare l'Ecc.mo Mgr. Antonio Papp, Amministratore Apostolico di Miskolcs, sui motivi che lo hanno indotto a prescrivere l'uso della lingua ungherese, invece della paleoslava, nelle Liturgie che si celebrano nella parrocchia di Rakaca.

In attesa, con sensi di distinto ossequio ho il piacere di confermarvi di Vostra Eccellenza Reverendissima

aff.mo come fratello

Eugenio card. Tisserant

segr.

A Sua Eccellenza Reverendissima

Mgr. ANGELO ROTTA

Nunzio Apostolico in Ungheria

BUDAPEST

8.

Budapest, 1938. július 23.

Angelo Rotta nuncius Papp Antal miskolci apostoli kormányzóhoz

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 54r– concept.)

1481/38. 23 Julii 1938.

Excellentissime ac Reverendissime Domine,

Ad notitiam Sacrae Congregationis „Pro Ecclesia Orientali” pervenit, quod, per mandatum Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae, in paroecia Rakaca loco linguae paleoslavicae hucusque in Liturgia Sacra peragenda adhibitae, lingua hungarica fuerit recenter introducta. Ipsa S. Congregatio per tramitem huius Nun-

tiaturae Apostolicae rogat Excellentiam Tuam, ut eidem patefacere velit rationes, quae Excellentiam Tuam moverint ad illam mutationem inducendam: quod certo certius Excellentia Tua Reverendissima pronto animo praestare dignabitur.

Libenti animo hac utor occasione, ut Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae obsequii mei sensus depromam Suisque precibus commendatus permaneo
Excellentiae Tuae Illustrissimae ac Reverendissimae
addictissimus in Christo

Archiepiscopus Thebar.
Nuntius Apostolicus

Excellentissimo ac Reverendissimo
Domino ANTONIO PAPP
Archiepiscopo Cizicien., Administratori Apostolico
MISKOLC

9.

Miskolc, 1938. augusztus 8.

Papp Antal érsek Angelo Rotta nunciusához

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 55^{rv}– cop.)

Alleg. Al No. 1546/38. 1536/38 (Copia)

MISKOLCI APOSTOLI ADMINISTRATURA. N. 1536/38 II or. 987 1938.

Excellentissime ac Reverendissime Domine
Archiepiscope, Nuntie Apostolice!

Nexu litterarum aestimatissimarum Excellentiae Tuae in negotiis linguae liturgicae parochiae meae Rakacaensis sub Numero 1481/38. ad me directarum sumo mihi honorem responsum meum post necessarias investigationes domesticas concinnatum Excellentiae Tuae humiliter prosternendi.

Haud dubie difficile est pro me obligatio respondendi sine cognitione quaerelae ac accusatoris. Studebo tamen rem ipsam ita dilucidare, ut verà, rectius maligna causa criminis temerarii patefaceretur.

Materia quaestionis est, quod in paroecia mea Rakacaensi „per mandatum meum loco linguae paleoslavicae hucusque in Liturgia Sacra peragenda adhibitae lingua Hungarica fuerit recenter introducta”. Crimen sic relatam prorsus est falsum et malevolum, quia omnes instructiones meae hac re editae praecipue ac singulariter ad defendendam linguam paleoslavica nobis a S. Sede Apostolica praescriptam fuerunt accomodatae.

Quando a. D. 1925. regimen Administrationis huius Apostolicae suscepi, cognovi nonnullos sacerdotes meos, magna levitate utentes, qui Liturgiam Sacram

integram, non excepto etiam canone ipso una cum verbis sanctissimis consecrationis, lingua Hungarica cantabant juxta praxim multorum curionum parochiarum vicinarum Dioeceseos Hajdudorogensis, quae in opinione publica qua diocesis unica Hungarica appellatur. E contrario, inveniebantur etiam sacerdotes, qui et partes dialogicas (ektenias) quasi litanias – non partes essentielles liturgiae – idest invocationes ad populum a sacerdote directas (ac responsiones) abnuerunt lingua hungarica decantare.

Ultimis his annis contentio haec me re nationalis ac politica, nec non vana ambitio merita extraordinaria nationalia per introductionem et extentionem in Liturgiam linguae hungaricae libidinosam acquirendi, adeo inordinata evasit et fideles quoque suae potestati subjecit, quod etiam accurate, parochiani mei Rakacaenses litteras supplices miserunt ad Administrationem politicam comitatus Borsodiensis, ut pro illis, qua bonis patriotis Hungaricis linguam liturgicam Hungaricam efflagitaret.

Tunc mentem Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae quoad linguas liturgicas historicas uberius pertractando, conabar potestati civili explanare, quod questio haec sine indulto benigno SS. Patris Nostri Summi Pontificis viribus nostris haud solvi potest et non est in potestate mea tantam summi gravitatis mutationem introducere.

Explanatio mea vero non pervenit ad exitum optatum, quia a parte auctoritatis politicae, maxima ex parte acatholicae, haud ex se intelligitur factum id, quod in dioecesi Hajdudorogensi, cuius populationis constitutio ethnologica nempe ac ethnographica eadem est cum [fol. 55v] constitutione territorii Administrationis meae, introductio linguae hungaricae plena in Sacra Liturgia sine ulla objurgatione S. Sedis Apostolicae per longum et latum ad finem ducta est, cur non posset etiam Administratio mea veniam impetrare?

Nec oratores parochiani mei fuerunt resolutione mea mitigati, nam post breve tempus idonea videbatur illis etiam ista via insolita, quod precibus suis animum Gubernatoris nostri, Serenissimi Domini Nicolai Horthy sibi conciliare ac introductionem linguae Hungaricae in Sacram Liturgiam sic obtinere temptabant.

Iterum uberius explanavi, ac per tramitem Ministerii Cultus Suae Serenitati prosternere conabar relationem meam, iterum defendendo iura historica atque juridica linguae liturgicae paleoslavicae.

Hic fateri debemus autem, quod juxta indicia officialia statisticae hungaricae fideles mei sine exceptione nationalitatem hungaricam profitebantur, licet lingua eorum nativa ruthenica adhuc saltem senioribus nota est.

Consideratis circumstantiis his superius memoratis, a. 1937, rem litigiosam in ordinem redigere anhelans, sententiam enuntiavi, quod etiam parochus Rakacaensis tenetur partes Liturgiae Sacrae dialogicas (ektenias-litaniis similes), sed nunquam et nullo modo orationes Sacrae Liturgiae, juxta perantiquam consuetudinem territorii nostri lingua hungarica decantare, cum fideles ad invocationes sacerdotis in Liturgia sacra decantatas jam etiam in Rakaca assidue lingua hunga-

rica respondebant et cantabant. Consuetudinem hanc etiam in Relatione mea quinquennali jam anno 1935 sanctae Sedi et Congregationi pro Ecclesia Orientali scriptotenus referre ausus sum sequentibus his verbis. „In parochiis nostris labii puri hungarici cantus a populo, invocationes ad populum directae necnon responsio populi fit lingua hungarica ex antiquissima, consuetudine, sicut consuetudo haec, quoad usum Dioecesis Haidudorogensis in Statistica officiali della Gerarchia e dei fedeli di Rito Orientale superius memoratae (v. pag. 226) memoratur.

Itaque hac in re omnia regulariter et maxima, qua par est reverentia ac oboedientia erga Sanctam Sedem Apostolicam persolvere conabar, istis cum humilibus precibus adeo Excellentiam Tuam Reverendissimam, ut relationem meam hanc benigne accipere, S. Congregationi pro Ecclesia Orientali clementer prosternere et istam gratiam efflagitare dignetur ut calumniator vel calumniatores in sensu Canonis 2355 puniantur.

Liceat mihi denuo humiliter ac fideliter notare etiam id, quod non est quod miremur, quando fideles mei nationalitatem hungaricam profitentes, – quos propter linguam liturgicam paleoslavica, qua ruthenos (ucranos) potestates civiles in suspicionem vocant, et ulterius suspicari possent, – linguam liturgicam hungaricam introducere anhelant, cum e contra praxis Dieceseos Haidudorogensis etiam in publicationibus radiophonicis officialibus „qua ritus hungaricus” pronuntiatur.

Singulari cum veneratione et obsequii cultu perenni.

In Miskolc, die 8 mensis Augusti a. D. 1938.

Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae
Addictissimus in Christo

Antonius Papp
Archiepiscopus Cyzicensis
Administrator Apostolicus

Locus Sigilli

Excellentissimo ac Reverendissimo Domino
Domino ANGELO ROTTA
Archiepiscopo, Nuntio Apostolico
BUDAPEST

IO.

*Budapest, 1938. augusztus 13.**Angelo Rotta nuncius a Keleti Kongregációnak*

(ASV Arch. Nunz. Budapest, busta 57, fasc. 2. Hajdúdorog, fol. 56r– concept.)

1479 1546/38 II. Or. 13 Agosto 1948 (con inserto)

Eminenza Reverendissima,

In conformità alle istruzioni datemi dall'Eminenza Vostra Reverendissima con Suo venerato dispaccio in data 19 Luglio 1938. N. 358/38. mi sono rivolto a Mons. Papp, Amministratore Apostolico di Miskolc, per domandargli le ragioni della prescrizione data per l'uso della lingua ungherese in luogo della paleoslavica nella Liturgia nella parrocchia di Rakaca.

Invio qui acclusa la risposta da Lui inviata, e di cui ho fatto copia per questo Archivio. Più o meno sono le stesse ragioni che io sospettava [!], come dal mio Rapporto 1455-/1938 in data 14 Luglio.

Chinato al bacio della Sacra Porpora coi sensi della più profonda venerazione ho l'onore di raffermarmi

dell'Eminenza Vostra Reverendissima

Arcivescovo tit. di Tebe,

Nunzio Apostolico

A Sua Eminenza Reverendissima

Il Signor Cardinale EUGENIO TISSERANT

Segretario della S. C. „Pro Ecclesia Orientali”

Città del Vaticano

VÉGHSEŐ TAMÁS

HUNGARY AND THE HOLY SEE OF ROME

Hungarian Historical Researches of the 21th Century in the Vatican

THE RELATIONS OF CHARLES I AND THE PAPACY RELYING UPON THE VATICAN SOURCES¹

Despite the fact that the most important events of the diplomatic relations between Charles I (of the House of Anjou), King of Hungary (1301–1342) and the papal court are already known in the Hungarian historiography, many aspects of this topic remained unelaborated. Through thorough analysis, the purpose of my researches is on the one hand to exhibit the change of the foreign affairs of the Hungarian king and the Popes (Boniface VIII, Benedict XI, Clement V, John XXII and Benedict XII), and on the other hand to thematically systematize and depict in detail the cases related to both parties.

It was proved through the analysis that, though, the majority of the sources on the diplomatic relation between the Holy See and the Hungarian king are long known in the Hungarian historiography, we should throw a new light upon many aspects and questions. Besides, the sources served new information on such central and poorly explored questions as how the two powers communicated, in what forms and channels and by whom they were represented. Above all, the remuneration policy of the Popes of Avignon was one of such topics, of which analysis has brought the most new results.

In the Avignon era the Holy See's claim to reach papal universalism, centralism and intermediate part was reflected in the beneficial policy of the Popes, too. Not only did the era create a legal ground for the reservation of church benefices, but it also tried to enforce it by penetrating down to lower church levels. First of all, it can be stated that the majority (70%) of the regulations related to the *beneficium*s in Hungary are from John XXII's age. The reason for this is on the one hand the Pope's long reign (it is 18 years out of the 41 that was analysed), on the other hand the character of John XXII's

¹ See pp. 9–30.

remuneration policy. By examining the remuneration policy of Clement V, Benedict XII and John XXII it became unambiguous that there are significant differences between the three Popes in the case of smaller benefices (i.e. non-consistorial benefices): namely, John XXII annually dealt with smaller benefices roughly six times more than his predecessor or successor. Besides, under John XXII, the immediate provisions and the expectatives were edited approximately in equal number; one third of the benefices' reversioners did not get their first benefice. The analysis of the measures related to the benefices made it clear that Pope John XXII aimed at the practical enforcement of the *Ex debito* bull (1316), mainly in case of the greater consistorial benefices. Although it seldom occurred that the Pope appointed an absolutely new person (his own favourite) to some bigger benefices independent of the will of the chapter as well as the monarch, he endeavoured to conclude the cases (for instance by cancelling the election by referring to its invalidity, then appointing the original nominee after all) so that the authority of the beneficiary would not be depended on the capitular election but the Pope's favour.

Not only do the results conform with the conclusions of the researches on the papal beneficiary policy in the Avignon era accomplished considering other countries, but – also in Hungary's case – they verify the long existing opinion that John XXII endeavoured to expand the papal court's authority to the middle and lower levels of the church as much as he could. Furthermore, the effect of the diplomatic events to the beneficiary policy was also demonstrable: in the course of the important negotiations the number of the expectatives was significantly increased. This fact strengthens the assumption that the monarchs often tried to reward the diplomatic service with church benefices. However factual proof of the success of the expectative rights' enforcement was found in rare occasions, which suggests that the filling of the church benefices depended on the local conditions rather than the papal order.

The earlier secondary literature put great emphasis on establishing whether the Pope's or the monarch's will was prevailed in the filling of the church benefices. Yet, the sources prove that such rivalry did not exist in the first half of the fourteenth century. The papal and the royal beneficiary policy seem parallel rather than opposing, which rarely created a conflict between the two powers. If we search for the traces of such conflicts, we would rather focus on the prelates' synod of 1318 in Kalocsa, or on the written complaint of 1338 sent to Benedict XII; as these reflect those who fought for the controlling of the church benefices.

“PETRUS STEPHANI COLLECTOR APOSTOLICUS”²

The paper shows in detail the activities of Petrus Stephani as a tax collector, functioning in the Polish–Hungarian district between 1373 and 1375. This choice was primarily motivated by the favourable source conditions, namely apart from his book of accounts numerous documents of the Holy See related to his activities as well as some charters issued *in partibus* survived.

Péter, son of István was appointed a tax collector by Gregory XI on 12 February 1372; he was responsible for the territory of the Hungarian and the Polish Kingdom as well as for Silesia, which was a part of the Czech crown, though, belonged to the Polish church administration.

He arrived to Hungary in January, 1373, yet, he could start working only 11 months later due to the opposition of Louis I. He started working in Poland in the spring of 1373, however, his activity was frequently hindered by the tax collectors working in parallel to him. He had two permanent residencies, one in Krakow and the other in Felhévíz, located near Buda.

During his function he was in continuous connection with the Curia in Avignon. From Avignon, he continuously received the essential lists of benefices and the various supplementary instructions related to his activities. In many cases, Péter also sent legates to the papal court to clear certain questions.

He was naturally assisted by many people, on the one hand by the direct attendants, on the other hand by the members of his office. The sub-collectors, appointed by Péter, were indispensable members of the people of the collector. In the Hungarian part of the district of the collector there were at least 19 centres of the sub-collectors in five significant collegial churches (Pozsony [Bratislava], Szepes, Óbuda, Fehérvár and Pozsega [Požega]) besides the archiepiscopal and the episcopal centres. The duty of the sub-collectors was to actually collect and run the administration of the tax, furthermore, to employ church censure against those who refused to pay. We know all-in-all six sub-collectors working in Hungary in the examined period; every one of them was the canon of their districts' cathedral.

85% of the collected tax went to Avignon through banks. One of the important stations of the transport was Bruges, to where primarily the merchants of Krakow transferred the collected tax. They placed the sums in the branch banks of the Flemish town – which was one of the most important trading centres of the age – which were related to the papal court, and then they were sent further to the *Camera Apostolica*. The role of Venice was also significant at that time, namely a considerable part of the collected tax reached its destination through the banks of the Adriatic city. During Petrus Stephani's activity as a collector the Florentine companies (Alberti Antichi, Donatus Guidonis, Maf-

² See pp. 31–88.

feo Lotto, Vieri di Cambi di Medici) took part in the Polish and Hungarian money's transfer. The Florentine Francesco di Bernardo da Ramignano, who settled in Buda, also played a crucial role in these financial transactions.

Petrus Stephani collected altogether 22,848 Hungarian golden forint for the Apostolic Camera, out of which he forwarded 20,455 forints to Avignon, while his sub-collectors 2,286. The difference might origin from the depreciation resulted from the change, or from the tax that Péter's predecessors collected and he also made an entry of. Péter personally presented his accounts in the Apostolic Camera, where the fiscal clerics carefully examined and prepared its short abstract (*computus brevis*). Thereafter, Péter was charged with another commission as a collector, however, at this time only to the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom, since the Polish-Hungarian *collectoria* was divided in 1377.

In the final chapter of the paper, the ecclesiastical career of Petrus Stephani is analysed, which completed itself in parallel to his activity as a tax collector. His career cannot be divided from the support of Cardinal Guillaume de la Jugie, who entrusted Péter with the administration of the Hungarian and Polish church benefices, of which he was in charge. It became clear through the detailed analysis that the earlier research contaminated two persons. As a result, the major part of the Hungarian secondary literature identified Collector Petrus Stephani with Péter Knol, secret chancellor than later the bishop of Transylvania. On the basis of former researches of the author, Petrus Stephani is identified with the French Petrus de Monasterio, whose appointment as a collector was hugely influenced by his protector, Cardinal Vilmos. The ecclesiastic career of Péter was the following: the canon of Eger (1360–1376), the precentor of Kalocsa (1361), the archdeacon of Szabolcs (1361–1375), the priest of Calhano (1372–1376), the canon and the *rector altaris* of Esztergom (1373–1390), the provost of Dömös (1374–1379), the canon of Boroszló (1375–1376), the *hospitarius* of the *Cruciferi Sancti Stephani Regis* of Felhévíz and Esztergom (1390–1392).

TAMÁS FEDELES

"PARTES UNGARIE...SATIS OCCUPATE CUM TURCIS."

THE TURKISH QUESTION IN HUNGARY IN THE PAPAL BOOKS OF REQUEST OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY³

The increasing Muslim authority occupied a bridge-head on the European continent in the middle of the fourteenth century. From this time on, as the danger became increasingly realized, two Christian states were more and more

³ See pp. 89–106.

dependent on each other: the head of the Christian world – the papacy – and the Hungarian Kingdom, which consciously took on the role of the bastion of Christianity over a century. From their opening, the papal archives continuously vented sources that proved the mutual dependence and centuries-long cooperation of the two most threatened powers; EDGÁR ARTNER selected an independent collection from the rich sources. Through the series of VILMOS FRANKÓI and the publication of ARTNER that remained in a manuscript for a long time, the historical researches explored those tools – especially the diplomacy, through which the Popes sent allowances to the Hungarian Kingdom and urged the Western powers to act –, by the help of which the Roman Curia also took its share of the Christian world's defence by covering some burdens. However, recently it has occurred that the Vatican archives' documents of smaller importance also hid historical data that vary this question; they do not throw light upon the mutual battle on the level of power politics, but rather through the incidents of the everyday life. In many cases the *supplicationes* handed in the Roman Curia in the fifteenth century and granted by the Pope contain references to the extraordinary everyday life of the Hungarian-Turkish borderland.

By the help of them, one can understand more the effect of the Muslim world's vicinity to the people living in the frontier zone: it uniquely formed the consciousness of identity and the motivation behind the actions. The tissue of the identity of Christianity that had been invulnerable became cracked, which had destructive effect on the forces of the religious belief that united Europe from the periphery towards the central territories, however, temporarily only to a small degree. The requests signed by the Popes show that by channelling a significant part of the curial incomes the prelates of Rome made a sacrifice for stem the course of events. A *supplicatio* from the middle of the fourteenth century declares the appropriation of the punitive duties against the "pagans". There are many cases from the fifteenth century that those Byzantines who were escaping from Constantinople in a desperate situation were provided the opportunity to give indulgences (after all, they were related to the authorization of free choice of confessor), which enabled them to collect money to ransom their relatives in captivity.

The research explored that Pope Martin V allowed the representatives of the members of the Order of Hospitallers of Rhodes to authorize the free choice of confessor for those throughout Europe who aided the order fighting on the Islam front. This paper presents many sources found in manuscripts to show that the duties of the curial administration were sometimes spent on the defence against the Turks. Namely in many cases, the condition of granting the approval of the supplication and the requested dispensation was either entering the war or sending soldiers in the war on their money. One of the reasons of the occurrence – naturally besides the fact that the danger and its fear was increasing

in the progress of time – could be that the argumentation of the requests more often contained mention of a contravention committed in situations provoked by the Turks. This small contribution also proves that the Popes' power of absolution was not primarily a tool of the contraventions causing Reformation but to help the distressed Christians.

KORNÉL SZOVÁK

MEMBERS OF THE DIOCESE OF GYŐR IN ROME
OF THE LATE MIDDLE AGES⁴

The idea of categorizing and publishing the sources according to dioceses already existed in the early days of the Hungarian researches in the Vatican, we should only think of the volumes of the *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis* edited by VILMOS FRANKÓI and JÓZSEF LUKSICS. In 1909, Miklós Széchenyi, bishop of Győr entrusted his secretary ÁRPÁD NITSCH (later BOSSÁNYI) to publish the sources of the Vatican related to the diocese of Győr along a similar concept. However, the undertaking was not successful: the collections unfortunately were not published and the two volumes of the *Regesta supplicationum* – that came out and published an already proofread archival material on lower level than its predecessors – can be caution also to the present researches.

The detailed analysis of the presence of the Hungarians in medieval Rome is not completed yet – due to the lack of the complete exploration of the sources. The analysis of those who visited Rome for various reasons from the same diocese has not been attempted yet. The collected persons are divided into groups according to their motives to visit Rome. On this basis, one can state that there were people who stayed in Rome by occupation, in the service of the papacy. The successor of St. Peter was not only the head of the church, but also a monarch, who played an active political role in Italy as well as in Europe; therefore, he was frequently visited for diplomatic reasons. Many ecclesiastical and secular persons visited the Pope to ask for justice or his benevolence, be it related to a church benefice, to the admission to the holy orders, to giving absolution or indulgence. As the tribunals of the Curia served as courts of appeal, many travelled to Rome owing to their cases. The tombs of St. Peter and Paul were the most visited place of pilgrimage at that time; therefore, thousands of pilgrims visited them. Besides, we find examples of those, who were attracted by the Eternal City in view of researches and study.

⁴ See pp. 107–136.

One can state after a thorough examination that, though, the diocese of Győr was a medium one among the Hungarian dioceses considering its wealth and members, it had manifold relations to the Roman Curia. Naturally, the diocese of Győr – similarly to the other dioceses in Hungary – lacked the permanent representation in Rome. Mainly personal relations and personal administration dominated; therefore there were often ad hoc solutions. People arriving in Rome could attend to many businesses at once by exploiting the Eternal City being “multifunctional”. Knowing the many forms of networking, the aims and motivation of those staying in Rome, the question is reasonable; how similar was the intensity of the relations of the diocese of Győr with the centre of the Catholic Church compared to that of the other dioceses in Hungary.

If we examine the Hungarian related data collected from the Datary’s registers of supplications by PÁL LUKCSICS and from the bull registers of the Vatican and Lateran dated between 1417 and 1453 in parallel with the Hungarian requests handed in the *Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica* and the division after dioceses of those Hungarian pilgrims who entered the Society of the Holy Spirit in Rome and we add moreover the percentage distribution of certain Hungarian dioceses compared with the total population of the kingdom, we can state the following. The number of the petitioners from the diocese of Győr is somewhat overrepresented in accordance with the proportion of the population living there, while we can find comparatively few people entering the Society of the Holy Spirit. This is explained by ENIKŐ CSUKOVITS with the lack of the members of the SMOMs in Western Hungary, which caused slight notoriety. If we examine the origin of those who went to Rome from the diocese of Győr, we see that the majority of them were from Vas County, which gave almost the half of the population of the diocese of Győr. People arrived in the Eternal City in great number naturally from Győr, from the episcopal centre, besides Szombathely, Kőszeg and Rohonc. As a matter of curiosity, the name of the inhabitants of Sopron, the most significant town of the diocese, cannot be found in the sources of Vatican; however its opposite is likely if one reads their testaments.

If we compare the diocese of Győr with the archdiocese of Kalocsa – which had bigger population –, with the bishopric of Csanád and the diocese of Vác – of which population was more or less the same – we see that the most requests to both offices came from Győr and only the archdiocese of Kalocsa preceded Győr in the number of those who entered the Society of the Holy Spirit. The reasons of the occurrence can only be explained after a further study, yet one can reckon the negative effect of the Turkish destruction in case of Kalocsa and Csanád.

The diocese of Győr is average considering its population, economic-social circumstances and the intensity of its relations to the centre of the Church, or rather – compared to the other dioceses of Hungary – it was “middle-ranking”.

To get a whole picture of the Roman relations of the Hungarian Kingdom, in the future, one should run a similar examination on the other dioceses' relations to Rome and compare the results with each other, which enable us to outline the centre/periphery relation of Rome and the Hungarian church structure.

GÁBOR NEMES

ORDO REGUM

LISTS OF PRECEDENCE IN THE PAPAL COURT AND THE PLACE OF THE KING OF HUNGARY IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES⁵

The secondary literature on the history of diplomacy attributes the compilation of the hierarchy of 1504 listing every Christian monarchs and princes that was used for the reception of their representatives to Paride de Grassi, papal master of ceremonies. This list of precedence had significant afterlife, since it also influenced the diplomatic relations of the early modern period. The King of Hungary is also mentioned, he was the ninth. The study endeavours to answer the question whether this list really demonstrates the European authority of the King of Hungary. To do so, the all in all five versions of the list are examined with the help of philological techniques (they are signed with letters from *A* to *E*), their content is valued, the usage of hierarchy is introduced and certain examples of the disputes over the ranks found in Grassi's work of *Tractatus de oratoribus* (1508/1509) are analysed, which discusses the reception of the legates in Rome. (The paper leans on the results of PHILIPP STENZIG's dissertation.)

The lists of precedence were compiled to internal use, to organize events of protocol nature and to ease the work of the masters of ceremony. They were not publicly announced, official papal orders but assistances based on practice and formed by custom and European political circumstances. They were maintained in the documentation of the masters of ceremony (in diaries, notes) mainly in the various archives of the Vatican. On the basis of their content, namely which monarch is mentioned, the known lists can be put in chronological order. On the one hand it helps their interpretation; on the other hand the "evolution" of their adoption from the late fourteenth century to the mid sixteenth century can be demonstrated.

The earliest is the *C* version, known from the diary of Grassi, which is not a hierarchy yet, but a catalogue advancing according to the cardinal points. On the basis of its content, the *D* version might be dated back to the early fifteenth

⁵ See pp. 137–172.

century, the *B* version that occurs in Grassi's diary and in the *Tractatus* is from the mid-fifteenth century (from the 1460s), the *A* list, which was written down by Grassi in 1504, but actually can be attached to the work of his predecessor, Johannes Burckard, is from about the 1490s, while the *E* version, which can also be found in the composite volume of the early modern period, is from the 1550s.

However, the emerging disputes of certain monarchs' legates over the precedence were not solved on the grounds of the lists; they were settled and avoided according to the situation. The Pope does not change or specify the hierarchy, as he does not want to gratuitously favour or hurt any members of the Christian community. This is also proved by the analysis of 19 incidents from 1481–1504 listed in the *Tractatus de oratoribus*. Out of them, two Hungarian disputes over rank are presented in detail: in 1487 János Kamarcai Vitéz was involved in a dispute over precedence with the delegates of the Scottish king; in 1494 the delegates of Vladislaus II, king of Hungary and Bohemia, Tamás Bakócz, bishop of Győr and Antal Sánkfalvi, bishop of Nyitra came into conflict with the delegate of Naples. In both situations the parties were seated separately in the *Cappella Sistina*.

In spite of the above mentioned, the lists were regarded useful and applied assistances for the Apostolic See, therefore the place of the King of Hungary is also demonstrated by them – yet, not in terms of the European power politics of the late Middle Ages, but *only* of the papal court.

BÁLINT LAKATOS

THE SOURCES ON THE PROCESS OF GYÖRGY FRÁTER'S MURDER IN THE VATICAN ARCHIVES⁶

In the morning of 17 December, 1551, one of the most influential politicians of the Hungarian Kingdom, György Fráter (Martinuzzi), the primate of Hungary and the archbishop Esztergom, the voivode of Transylvania was found dead on the stone floor of the castle of Alvinc. The identity of his murderers was known: with the direction of Giovanni Battista Castaldo, marquis and Sforza Pallavicini, chief-sergeant, the mercenaries of Ferdinand I killed him. This action created a huge stir not only in the kingdom, but throughout the whole Christian Europe, and led to one of the most acute crisis of the Habsburg-papal relations. According to canon law, those who were responsible became automatically excommunicated, and though, Julius III temporarily dis-

⁶ See pp. 173–186.

pensed the monarch, a long investigation started, of which purpose was to find György Fráter guilty, by this means to prove the murder rightful.

The examination, lasting for years, was led by Count Abbot Girolamo Martinengo, the nuncio to the court of Ferdinand, and then it was concluded by his successor, Zaccaria Delfino in 1554. By the help of a "questionnaire" of 87 points, 139 evidences were given as well as numerous letters and extracts of letters related to the case were collected. A significant part of these sources can be found in the Vatican Secret Archives. Certain documents already became public by the researches of GYULA SZEKFŰ and GÁBOR BARTA in the last century; however, numerous ones did not or only partially, so their utilization can enrich the already existing picture. The paper presents these documents and those sources that serve information on the examination by touching upon the fact that the accurate exploration of this source-basis and its critical edition could significantly help the understanding of the so troubled decade between 1541 and 1551, moreover, it would present an opportunity to explore a historic phase of the Habsburg-papal diplomatic relations with micropolitical profoundness.

VIKTOR KANÁSZ

JESUIT GIOVANNI ARGENTI ON THE AFFAIRS IN TRANSYLVANIA
THE DEFENSIO SOCIETATIS JESU AND THE DIET OF MEDGYES IN 1605⁷

The paper analyses the close relation of religion and politics with reference to Jesuit Giovanni Argenti's works of *Defensio* and *De Societate* and to the diet of Medgyes in 1605. After the start of the Bocskai Uprising in 1604, the order had to leave Hungary as well as the principality of Transylvania. Among the reasons were those mistakes that the Jesuits committed and that intense hatred that followed the order's function. This opposition was not derived only from direct experience but also from the international experience that – along with the international anti-Jesuit propaganda – reinforced the atmosphere, which led to the expropriation of the properties of the Jesuits in Transylvania. This practically introduced the order of the Treaty of Vienna (1606) which resulted in the loss of the order's possessions in Hungary.

In his two works, Argenti shows his Humanist education in connection with the repudiation of the accusations against the Society; the dichotomy between barbarism and civilisation is in the focus of his argumentation in such a manner that he identifies the former with heresy and the latter with the true faith. Simultaneously, he admits their mistakes which contributed to the devel-

⁷ See pp. 187–200.

opment of the public opinion against the order. His two works call the attention to the fact that the so far neglected documents of the Catholics written with the purpose of apologetics – of which significant part is definitely that of Argenti's work – constitute a part of the Catholic-Protestant polemic evolved after the Bocskai Uprising.

TAMÁS KRUPPA

FERENC GALLA'S ORIGINAL MONOGRAPH ON THE MISSIONS IN THE
TERRITORY UNDER TURKISH RULE
(DATA FOR THE HISTORY OF THE RECONSTRUCTION OF A TEXT)⁸

The paper deals with a monograph of FERENC GALLA, which survived in a manuscript, and its publication and reconstruction. The writer worked as a church historian and a lecturer in the first half of the twentieth century, *The Papacy and the Turkish Peril* is a late work of his, and this might be the reason why it remained in the drawer. The manuscript, which survived in a terrible state so in its original form it was impossible to be published, is preserved in the Hungarian National Archives. First, the text was reconstructed, then it went through an analysis relying on archival and bibliographical researches, which examined whether the book was worthy of publication considering its data. This process was followed by a thorough statistical clarification, the text's division into chapters and then the substitution and reconstruction of the completely missing notes took place. In the end of the work a monograph was born out of the text wreck, which became suitable for publication as regards its data and structure.

GÁBOR KISVARGA

AUDIENCE IS DENIED. THE HOLY SEE AND THE COURT OF VIENNA
UNDER THE ROMAN LEGATION OF COUNT GEORG ADAM VON MARTINITZ
(1695–1699)⁹

Count Georg Adam von Martinitz, imperial legate arrived in Rome in December 1695, though his predecessor, Anton Florian von Liechtenstein had already left one and a half years earlier. The count's legacy in Rome did not

⁸ See pp. 201–228.

⁹ See pp. 229–242.

started well as he got involved in a dispute over precedence with the viceroy of Rome, Ranuccio Pallavicino already in the spring of 1696. This conflict reached its peak in 1696 on the Corpus Christi procession, when the service was delayed almost for two hours due to Martinitz's intentional slow moving. Therefore, a couple of days later, the whole College of Cardinals intentionally withdrew its presence from the traditional service in the *Santa Maria dell' Anima*, the church of the German nation in Rome. This question of protocol significantly burdened the relations of the two courts in the following period.

In 1697, the imperial diplomat encountered another conflict with the Roman Curia, since he released the imperial edict that obligated the imperial vassals in Italy to do another homage and affirm their feudal estate. After the Holy See released a counter-edict, the relations of Rome and Vienna grew cold, which was further increased in the following summer. Don Agostino Chigi received an imperial notice to do his compulsory homage to his estates in Farnese. The papal court suspected partly Martinitz's contribution behind the scenes.

The old Innocent XII finally lost his patience after another unpleasant event. Martinitz took one of his valets prisoner after a poisoning in his house and demanded justice, however, he was reluctant to deliver him up to the Roman authorities. Moreover, he more and more openly accused the viceroy of Rome, Ranuccio Pallavicino of planning the poisoning. He accused the viceroy on a papal audience on 29 August 1698 and requested a procedure. Thereupon, the indignant Pope refused to tolerate the imperial legate in his presence.

These all led to Martinitz's fall, however, his summoning home took a long time, since there was not a vacant position in Vienna, which could account for his calling back. Martinitz finally left Rome on 23 April 1700, when he was appointed as the head of the archery guards.

BÉLA VILMOS MIHALIK

THE VERBALS OF THE HUNGARIAN BISHOPS'
CANONICAL EXAMINATION 1605–1711
(HISTORIOGRAPHY AND PROJECT PLAN)¹⁰

The first half of the paper surveys the international secondary literature on the verbals of the canonical examination. The main works of WALTER FRIEDENSBURG, LOUIS JADIN, HUBERT JEDIN, REMIGIUS RITZLER are thoroughly presented; furthermore, besides the German, Austrian and Belgian

¹⁰ See pp. 243–316.

results are shown, the publications of the Italian, Irish, Polish, Bulgarian and Croatian researches are taken into account. On the one hand, this introduction wants to present this extraordinary type of source of the Vatican Archives and the process based on it in a historiographical approach. On the other hand, it lists the possible ways of elaboration, which could give a proper basis for the Hungarian related material's methodical research and its exploitation.

Thereafter, the earlier Hungarian researches are presented. It is a historiographical curio that the Hungarian erudition of the Baroque era already used the verbals of the canonical examinations. Within the frame of the source-collecting program initiated and supported by Lipót Kollonich GÁBOR HEVENESY prepared extracts on the processes preserved in the palace of the nunciature of Vienna situated in the *Am Hof*. The first published data from them can be found in the volumes of KÁROLY PÉTERFFY on the history of councils and in the volumes of JÓZSEF KOLLER on the history of the diocese of Pécs. In the period between the two world wars, the works of the Benedictine TIHAMÉR VANYÓ and FERENC GALLA, priest of the diocese of Vác are significant. The methodical exploitation of the abundant source-material, of which importance was also highlighted by LAJOS PÁSZTOR, was not completed despite the repeated attempts. The documents on many bishoprics under Turkish rule – with the use of the statements and appendices related to the state of the diocese – were elaborated in several essays by ANTAL MOLNÁR.

The aim of the publication is to take the premises, experience and results of the international and Hungarian historiography into account as well as to concisely outline the premises, aim, form and standpoints of the planned project. In addition, the catalogue of the analysed verbals is published, at the same time the unique nature of the processes and their historical source-value are presented.

The material should not be interpreted in the Vatican's scope, but exclusively in the context of archontology, prosopography and biography in the long run, furthermore, it should be exploited as an important preparatory work in the Vatican for a Hungarian ecclesiastical archontology of the early modern period. The research, as a consequence, is nothing else but the completion, continuation of the *Hierarchia Catholica* on a local level. The main purpose is the deeper exploitation of the consistorial sources of the Vatican for the benefit of the Hungarian ecclesiastical archontology and prosopography of the early modern period and its preparatory work in the Vatican. The verbals of the canonical examination are in the centre of the research, the consistorial propositions and notes are of secondary importance at this stage of the research. The processes and their supplementary documents are going to be exploited even if they did not get in the papal collections. At the moment there are five such materials known, one from the state archives of Mantua,

four from the Aldobrandini archives in Frascati. According to the current information, in the Vatican Archive there are all in all 250 items until 1711 (168 from the nunciature of Vienna, 64 from the consistorial archive, 18 from the archive of the Datary). The reference catalogue of the processes is fundamentally prepared on the basis of the volumes of the *Sala dei Indici* of the Vatican, however, the dates on the basis of the verbals survived from the period of the examinations, the earliest from 1612 (János Pyber, Pécs) and the latest from 1709 (for instance bishops Imre Esterházy, Tinin and Benedek Ráttkay Zengg-Modrus).

The maxim of the examination of archontological purpose gives grounds for the “division” of the verbals. Namely, only the “personal part” will be covered in the research, considering the statements given or the supplements, which will mostly be published in form of abstracts. Besides the huge amount of the documents, this unique dichotomy of the sources hampered the uniform elaboration of the material of the whole primatial province of the Hungarian Kingdom, since parallel work had to be done of prosopographical and diocese-historical nature.

The primary supplements themselves – which can be exploited in archontological/prosopographical and in case of a deeper personal analysis biographical respect – are real *Hungaricum*-curios that cannot be found in Hungary from this early period; their narrow spectrum is shown by the source-selection at the end of the publication. One can read birth and baptismal certificates (no. 11, 17, 23, 27, 28); the direct or indirect certificates of university studies; documents on ordination or consecration (no. 1, 6, 16); the certification of the financial background required for a bishop (no. 7, 9); many CVs (no. 2, 3, 4, 8); certificates of the chapter, ordinary, the monastic prefect or a colleague on the intellectual and pastoral qualities and moral integrity of the appointed together with some biographical details (no. 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 29); furthermore letter of recommendation to an Episcopal appointment (no. 25); and medical expert opinion on “mental hygiene” that is regarded as a special record of history of medicine (no. 30). Similarly to the last two, the documents dealing with the concrete details of the examination, with practical or conceptual problems are less frequent in the verbals, therefore in our collection: the letters requesting the launch of the examination, dealing with the supplements (no. 8, 14); the documents on the recruiting of the witnesses (no. 15); the paper discussing the history of the bishopric, the already mentioned letter that complained about the protraction of the process of confirmation (no. 13). The memorial that requests the appointment of an auxiliary bishop and circumspectly argues for it is a special rarity; moreover it could be a smaller *ad limina* report (no. 19).

The “personal material” of the processes – besides the “pure” biographical data – is suitable for an exploitation of various kinds, either if we take the state-

ments, or the supplements. They equally serve valuable information on the witnesses: their knowledge, their culture of remembrance, their personal relations and connections with the nominee. Besides the analyses that are partly fitted in the subject of *Memory Studies*, the uniquely built connections of the church elite of the early modern period can be outlined by the help of the material. The *Netzwerk* that can be reconstructed is manifold and versatile: it happens that a person is mentioned in various cases, or there are people mutually testifying against each other, naturally on different occasions. The supplements of the letters can support the mapping of the inner lines of fracture of the Hungarian episcopacy of the early modern period.

The research focusing on the “long seventeenth century” can be summarized in theses as follows: it includes the prosopographical analysis of the church elite of the denominational confrontations, then the Catholic expansion after the Council of Trent within the framework of a fond-like source exploration of the Vatican extending to the beginning of the consolidation of the eighteenth century. The project goes far beyond the strictly speaking dimensions of church history, namely it is about the main representatives, leaders of the *status ecclesiasticus* of the age, the leading order of feudalism that was repressed in parallel with the evolution of absolutism. Their role was extraordinarily unique in this process: they had to appear as the protector of the national/feudal tradition, identity and interests, while the main determinant and pillar of their career as well as their effort to religious hegemony was the Habsburg dynasty, which more and more lived under the influence of absolutism after Spanish and French examples.

Thanks to the research experience gained through the preparatory work, some of the earlier made mistakes are corrected at the end of the study. According to these corrections, the case of the papal filling of the bishopric sees in the seventeenth century was not automatically delivered to the Consistorial Congregation, only if a problem occurred. There are original verbals, not only official copies, also in the *Archivio Concistoriale* fonds of the Vatican Archives. REMIGIUS RITZLER's statement should be also revised that before the regulations of Gregory XV and Urban VIII the verbals of the canonical examinations were regarded as useless and object to discarding after the consistorial decision. The bequest of Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, however, is a substantial proof against this idea. Altogether 4 Hungarian and 21 other verbals survived there from the period between 1594 and 1620 by proving that the exploration of the family archives of the cardinal protectors could enrich the historical research with further information. Their catalogue is in the *Appendix* of the study.

THE HUNGARIAN EPISCOPAL PROCESSES OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY IN THE VATICAN SECRET ARCHIVES 1711–1780¹¹

In 1881, the Vatican Secret Archives (*Archivum Secretum Vaticanum*) was opened by Leo XIII to the researchers. The word of “Secret” implies only that it started its function as the private archive of the Popes, however, its material is openly accessible for the qualified researchers similarly to other state archives’ documents. Besides the archives of certain already non-existing offices of the Roman Curia, there are the historical archives of many still operating offices of the Curia. The documentation on the representatives of the papal diplomacy is also a significant and vivid material.

The material of the so called episcopal processes, the episcopal and archiepiscopal appointments’ canonical, informational processes (*processus informativus*, or in other name *processus inquisitionis*, or *processus canonicus*) are rarely researched, but valuable sources of church history. We can find such documents in three places in the Vatican Secret Archives. One of them is the material of the nunciatures that was already moved to the Vatican. Within the Archives of the Apostolic Nunciature of Vienna (*Archivio della Nunziatura di Vienna*), in Hungarian relation, the fonds of the *Canonical processes of the bishoprics and the abbacies* (in short canonical processes; *Processi Canonici dei vescovati e delle abbazie*, in short *Processi Canonici*) is where the documents can be read that originally remained in Vienna. The other place is the fonds of the Consistorial processes (*Processus Consistoriales*) in the Consistorial Archives (*Archivio Consistoriale*), where the material of the fair copies sent to Rome during the process of appointment from the nunciatures of the world is collected together. The third place is where the verbals related to the appointments can be found, in the fonds of the Processes of the Datary (*Processus Datariae*) in the Apostolic Datary (*Dataria Apostolica*); this material is on those canonical examinations that were not conducted in a nunciature but in Rome.

The regulation on the bishop nominees’ canonical examination goes back to the Middle Ages. The case of the nominee was heard according to the regulations of the Council of Trent that was specified by Gregory XIV in 1591. In 1627, the special instructions of Urban VIII specified the part that gave place to the questions of *processus informativus* which preceded the appointment by the Pope.

Usually, 2–3 witnesses were heard under oath and *sub secreto vocato*, namely in secret per question lines. They were selected by various criteria and often represented the higher society. The witnesses were not necessarily ecclesiastics. In the seventeenth-eighteenth century, there were 13 questions concerning the bishop nominee, of which purpose was to get to know the abilities and characteristics of the nominee; whereas, the other thirteen questions were re-

¹¹ See pp. 317–336.

lated to the state of the diocese. In case of transfer, the questions were of different nature and the questionnaire contained only ten questions. These statements from the seventeenth and even eighteenth century contained very interesting information on the state of certain territories, moreover often on the nominee, as well. Various documents were attached to the statements.

In this paper, only those prelates are examined who received their royal appointment under Charles III (1711–1740), or under Maria Theresa (1740–1780). Furthermore, the so-called elected bishops (*episcopus electus*), who had their episcopal title through a royal appointment, however, the Holy See failed to acknowledge it, are – naturally – left out.

138 appointments are known from the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, 80 (7 without a process) from the archdiocese of Esztergom and 58 (3 without a process) from the archdiocese of Kalocsa. The suffragan bishops are also on the list, those who were less researched yet.

TAMÁS TÓTH

THE RIGHT OF ROYAL PATRONAGE ON THE AGENDA OF THE
CONGREGATION FOR EXTRAORDINARY ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS
AROUND 1920¹²

The study deals with a rather often examined question in the light of the Hungarian archives. It shows the change of the attitude of the Holy See towards the Hungarian royal right of patronage of the Holy See relying on so far unknown sources of the Vatican Archives; primarily on the verbals of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs and their preparatory material of 2 February, 1919, 8 November, 1921 and 30 July, 1922.

The opinion of the cardinals of the congregation slightly altered during the examined period of time. In 1919, when Austria-Hungary was dissolved and the constitutional form changed, they thought that the right ceased to exist, namely, it did not devolve to the republic. Yet, the verbal does not imply when the secretary who prepared it reported to the Pope on the result of the conference of the cardinals, neither does it say whether there was a resolution made or the Pope approved it, or not.

Considering that in March 1919, the nuncio still carried on negotiations with the representatives of the government and consulted many significant persons – like Prince-Primate János Csernoch and Oszkár Charmant –, it may be presumed that final decision was not made due to the precarious situation.

¹² See pp. 337–360.

In March 1920, the constitutional form of Hungary became kingdom again, moreover, in July and October 1920, Hungary and the Holy See revived their diplomatic relations by sending legates to each other. Although the monarch, who stood aside from the public affairs, renounced his right of private patronage on 25 January, 1920, he did not do the same with his royal right of patronage. On 6 November, 1921 the national assembly declared the dethronement of the Habsburgs. The Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs convened its meeting on 8 November 1921 after such events. They came to an agreement that it would not be fortunate to publish a statement about the extinguishment of the royal right of patronage as regards the existence of the kingdom in Hungary. Hence, the constitutional form is a key circumstance. Furthermore, they stated that though they failed to credibly prove the historical antecedents, in the past the Pope had implicitly acknowledged the apostolic monarch's royal right of patronage. Finally, this led to the postponement of the decision. In the case of one of the most important licences of the royal right of patronage, of the episcopal appointments, the Holy See endeavoured to enforce a generally true standard: the filling according to canon law. The governments – if an earlier concordat had not stipulated otherwise – could only set a veto on the nominee. This policy was active in Hungary, too, since the patron was hindered in practicing his rights; later, his person was not definite. The question, in its complexity, recurred on the agenda of the congregation in 1937.

KRISZTINA TÓTH

AD LIMINA REPORTS FROM HUNGARY (1928)¹³

The *ad limina* visits of the Catholic Church's bishops, belonging to which they had to report on the state of their diocese, is an important factor of the Catholic church-model of the modern period. From 1919, they had to use a questionnaire of 100 points for the reports, which relied on the new Code of Canon Law while asking about the accomplishment of the episcopal duties, about the financial and spiritual state of the diocese, about the living conditions of the clergy, the regulars and the faithful and about the pastoral needs. Between the two world wars the reports of the bishoprics and the *nullius* arch-abbacy of Pannonhalma from Hungary were submitted to the Consistorial Congregation in every five years, though, for various reasons only the series of 1938 is complete. The reports of 1928 are worth the attention, since the added notes of Cesare Orsenigo, the apostolic nuncio of Budapest, survived. The nuncio, on

¹³ See pp. 361–376.

the one hand, declared the credibility of the reports; on the other hand he commented on certain points. The comments reveal what should be praised and what should be demanded on the basis of the episcopal reports. The questionnaire of the congregation and the opinion of the nuncio assert a particular ecclesiastic system of aspects, which attributed as much importance to the dignity of the liturgy and the spiritual life of the clergy as to the social influence of the Church and the success of the pastoral work.

MÁTÉ GÁRDONYI

THE “RAKACA-AFFAIR”

CONTRIBUTION TO THE RELATIONS OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE AND THE
HUNGARIAN BYZANTINE CATHOLICS BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS
(SOURCE-PUBLICATION)¹⁴

The treaty after World War I brought about a rather unique situation for the Byzantine Catholic communities remained within the new borders. Before the Treaty of Trianon great number (11% of the whole population), extensive church administration (one archdiocese and eight dioceses) and ethnic diversity (Ruthenians, Romanians, Slovaks, Hungarians) characterized the Byzantine Rite Catholics. However, after 1920 the rate of the Greek Catholics reduced to 2.2% and there remained only one Episcopal see remained within the new borders, which gathered parishes of mainly Hungarian language and identity.

This change took the involved ones as well as the surrounding majority society by surprise. The period between the two world wars was about seeking ways and means for the Hungarian Greek Catholics, which was made more difficult by the distrust and suspicion – based on the long established stereotypes that were strengthened by the shock of Trianon – of the majority society in “secular” as well as in church respect.

Our source-publication presents the details of an examination opened by the Holy See of a seemingly insignificant case, which was related to an especially delicate question in the given era, the question of the liturgical language. The methods used during the examination, the presuppositions, the formulation of the persons and the overall picture of the examination illustrate well the unique situation of the Hungarian Greek Catholics.

TAMÁS VÉGHSEŐ

¹⁴ See pp. 377–394.

THE ATTEMPT OF THE “CLERICAL REACTION” TO ESTABLISH THE ACADEMY OF SAINT STEPHEN IN EMIGRATION¹⁵

The clerical emigration in Rome, which was often called the “clerical reaction” by the followers of the Communist government, aroused the state security’s interest already in the early 1950s. It is not by chance, since they served the most information to the “biggest espionage centre”, the Vatican on the affairs of the Hungarian Church, moreover, they put great efforts to realize their political aims in various organizations. One of the outcomes of their efforts is the establishment of the Hungarian Catholic and Scientific Academy, which desired to represent the hindered (by the State Office for Church Affairs) and then suppressed Academy of Saint Stephen in Hungary. The presentation of the Academy – the circumstances of its establishment, the difficulties of its survival, the analysis of its significance with a view to the Hungarian intelligence – wishes to be a contribution to the history of the emigrational organizations.

LILLA FEHÉR

SUMMARY

This volume of studies is an important phase of the Vatican-Hungarian historical series, *Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae* (CVH) founded in the Péter Pázmány Catholic University (PPCU) in 2004. Like the previous volume (CVH I/8, with a similar main title of *Magyarország és a római Szentszék – Hungary and the Holy See of Rome*), it desires to give a scientific plan to the forthcoming five years. The majority of the studies in the volume edited in 2012 projected the important results of the just ending five-year-long period of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS) ‘Impetus-program’ in the form of a pre-study. This work likewise desires to serve the HAS-PPCU Vilmos Fraknoi Vatican Historical Research Group, which continues *alter idem* the researches of the Impetus project. The close connection is clear; while the symposium¹⁶ – being the basis of the volume – was organized by the Impetus Research Institute to introduce its re-

¹⁵ See pp. 395–407.

¹⁶ *Kultúra- és tudományköziség. Magyarástudomány a 21. században* (VIII. Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Kongresszus) [Culture and Interscience. Hungarology in the 21st Century (VIIIth Hungarology Congress)], Pécs August 22–27, 2016. The symposium of the “Hungarian Research in the Vatican in the 21st Century” had the most lecturers in the Congress organized in the hall of the University of Pécs by the Impetus Research Group on 23 August. The event was supported by the PPCU (KAP 16-71042-1.1 KP). The programme and its details: <http://institutumfraknoi.hu/archivum/2016> (August 23, 2016).

search group and to outline its scientific perspectives, the lectures-turned-studies already represent the first, introductory publication of the Fraknói-Research Group.

The Hungarian Academy of Sciences had already taken a significant move to restore the Roman intellectual and institutional legacy of its former secretary-general, Vilmos Fraknói by establishing the HAS-PPCU 'Impetus' Research Group, which focused on the research in the Vatican. The initiation of the Fraknói-Research Group – at present within the framework of the state-subsidized research program in the Pázmány Péter Catholic University – is the acknowledgement of the previous years' results and the realization of the huge opportunities of the historical research in the Vatican. With its foundation, the Academy revived the existence of the Hungarian historical research in the Vatican after seventy years; in 1948, on the eve of the Communist takeover, the Committee of the Hungarian Institute of History in Rome was terminated by treading the academic independence.

The chronological and thematic order of the volume's writings clearly outlines the planned focus and direction of the Fraknói-Research Group's researches. While the appearance of the Anjou era is new, the analysis of the late Middle Ages – the cameraltistic documents and the utilization of the supplications – has already been paid special attention. The exploration of the tithe collectors' work has already started in the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*. This time, the consequences of the expansion of the Islam – which is related to the recent common talk – are discussed on the basis of the requests lodged to the Curia. The introduction of the Roman presence of the persons from the diocese of Győr both elaborates the various curial sources – as well as the documents found in Hungarian places – and presents a useful methodological example for the diocese-history, too. The analysis of the place of Hungary in the ceremonial hierarchy of the papal court belongs to the domain of the court-researches that excited undiminished international interest.

The plan of the complete exploration, publication and a more thorough analysis of the sources related to György Fráter's trial desires to settle the long-standing debt of the Hungarian historiography. This is also true for the project of the research group focusing on the early modern period, as well as the methodical exploitation of the verbals of the canonical examinations, which are dealt with by two studies regarding the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The rich sources of the Jesuits from the early seventeenth century and the diplomatic correspondence of the nunciature of Vienna from the late seventeenth century occur. The missions of the Propaganda Congregation do not belong to the profile of the Fraknói-Research Group. The extremely valuable monograph of Ferenc Galla on the apostolic missions in the territories under Turkish rule is the last important chapter of the preservation of the manuscripts stranded in the drawer due to adverse circumstances of the twentieth century.

The third focus is on the twentieth century, beside the late Middle Ages and the early modern period. Until the documents of the pontificate of Pius XII (1939–1958) are classified, the period between the two world wars is in the centre. Apart from the problems of the consolidation of the Hungarian Greek Catholics after the Treaty of Trianon, the question of the right of patronage and the special documentary value of the restored *ad limina* reports – and their examination on the nunciature – are presented to show the directions and opportunities of the historical acquaintance in the Vatican source collection. One phase of the history of the Roman emigration after 1945 is revealed on the basis of the documents of the Saint Stephen House's archives.

Similarly to the publication edited five years ago, this volume embraces the writings of church history of the newly graduated pupils of the Catholic University as well as the more expert historian and theologian authors. This project is a natural collaboration with the work of the Church History Research Team of the Pázmány Péter Catholic University, founded back in 2009 along with the intention of Cardinal PÉTER ERDŐ, the founding rector. The PPCU Church History Research Team remains to be an important reference also for the Fraknói-Research Group similarly to the Impetus-period. Its president, *Mons.* Professor JÓZSEF TÖRÖK, is assisting our work in the future as a senior researcher and advisor. His assistance is extremely wide-ranging; it covers also the thorough proof-reading and corrections of the CVH volumes that ended certain programmes of research. An important element of the integration with the PPCU Church History Research Team is the proceeding elaboration of the *Formularium secundum modum et stilum alme ecclesie Strigoniensis*, known as the Codex Nyási, within the framework of the so-called KAP-project. However, the codex contains valuable Rome-related data; its dimensions have some significance beyond the above mentioned frameworks of the Hungarian historical research in the Vatican.

PÉTER TUSOR

Translated by ÁGNES PALOTAI